



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/670,772	09/26/2003	Young-Hun Choi	1293.1856	4334

21171 7590 02/23/2006

STAAS & HALSEY LLP  
SUITE 700  
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER
----------

WALSH, DANIEL I

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2876

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/670,772

**Applicant(s)**

CHOI, YOUNG-HUN

**Examiner**

Daniel I. Walsh

**Art Unit**

2876

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 December 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 4-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 18-21 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 and 22-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Receipt is acknowledged of the response received on 6 December 2005. An action on claims 4-31 appears below.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. Claims 6 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Re claim 6, it is unclear to the Examiner how/why a reset signal is output from the card to the reader. The Examiner notes that it is well known and conventional for a reader to reset the card, but it is unclear how/why claim 6 recites the card outputting a reset signal from the smart card. For purposes of Examination the Examiner will interpret the claim as the controller outputting a reset signal, as is conventional in the art.

It is unclear to the Examiner how information from the smart card is read and stored, and then the stored information is registered. Based upon the specification and previous claims, it appeared to the Examiner that registration involve storing of data, which then renders claim 23 redundant since the information is stored and then registered. For purposes of Examination, the Examiner has interpreted the claim to mean reading the information, registering the stored information, where registering includes storing the information.

Appropriate clarification/correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 4-6 and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wang (US 6,128,744).

For purposes of Examination, the Examiner has interpreted a computer starter as a display monitor as it controls the powering/operation of the display monitor connected to a system (computer system).

Re claim 4, Wang teaches a starter for an ATX computer. This is interpreted as a display monitor, as it monitors a computer for access, the computer including a display. Wang teaches an interface for communicating with a smart card containing personal identification information (as card is inserted), a detector detecting a signal through the interface determining insertion of the smart card into the display monitor (enable signal is generated), and a controller reading the personal identification information via the interface from the card and controlling turning a display of the display monitor on or off when the insertion of the card is detected (abstract and FIG. 1).

Re claim 5, the Examiner notes that controller 16 and control circuit 20 are interpreted as a controller/control means, which read from the card and control turning the display/computer on

or off. Accordingly, the controller 16 is interpreted as a smart card controller and circuit 20 is interpreted as a display microcomputer.

Re claim 6, a clock signal and reset signal are shown (FIG. 1).

Re claim 24, the limitations have been discussed above (FIG. 1).

Re claim 25, (FIG. 1) shows the claimed signals.

3. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Huang et al., as discussed above.

For purposes of Examination, the Examiner has interpreted a computer starter as a display monitor as it controls the powering/operation of the display monitor connected to a system (computer system).

Huang et al. teaches a method of turning a display on or off comprising registering information stored in a smart card into a storage unit (register 23), checking insertion of the card into the display monitor through an interface on the monitor (FIG. 2), and turning the display on when the information stored on the card is the same as that in the storage unit (abstract).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 7-9 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang, as discussed above, in view of Huang et al. et al., as discussed in the previous Office Action.

For purposes of Examination, the Examiner has interpreted a computer starter as a display monitor as it controls the powering/operation of the display monitor connected to a system (computer system).

Wang teaches that a comparison is performed to verify the contents of the card by comparing it to a memory.

Wang is silent to registering/storing the card information.

Huang et al. teaches that such user provided information can be stored in the data storage register 23.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Wang with those of Huang et al.

One would have been motivated to do this in order to have a memory to store inputted data so that a comparison can be efficiently performed between data in the memory, record keeping purposes, etc.

Re claim 9 and 22, though silent to deleting the Examiner notes that data register 23 is used to store the computer secure check data (which is the system records for users) and can also store the user secure check data (from the card). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art not to permanently record (to delete) the user secure check data after authentication. The Examiner believes that it would have been obvious not to record the card data permanently (to delete it) because it would constitute redundant data (duplicate of what is already stored, namely the computer secure check data). The Examiner notes that it would have been obvious to store the data temporarily for electronic comparison, and that after a authentication is complete, deletion would have been obvious to delete such data so that memory space can be provided for the user secure check data (system records) and not duplicate data of attempts, thus ensuring adequate memory space. The storing of such duplicate data would not serve a purpose and would only consume memory space, and the electronic storage of data for comparisons are well known and conventional in the art.

4. Claims 10, 11, 12, 26, 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang, as discussed above, in view of Bilich et al., as discussed in the previous Office Action.

For purposes of Examination, the Examiner has interpreted a computer starter as a display monitor as it controls the powering/operation of the display monitor connected to a system (computer system).

The teachings of Wang have been discussed above. Re claim 12, Wang teaches power provided to the card (FIG. 1). The Examiner notes that it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to provide power to the card, before reading the card in order to communicate with the card, as is conventional in the art.

Wang teaches the controller turns off the display when the presence of the card is not detected after a predetermined time.

Bilich et al. teaches turning off the computer when the card is removed, by a log off process of the user when a card is removed (FIG. 3). This is interpreted as turning off when the smart card is not inserted/no longer is inserted in the display monitor/system. The Examiner notes that this sequence occurs (log-off and shutdown) when the presence of a card is detected as removed. Bilich et al. teaches that the sequence involves a user logging off, but the Examiner notes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for the system to automatically log off and shut down/power down when a card is removed, in order to provide additional security (no access is given with no card present) or additional convenience to the user (not having to manually log out). Re claim 26, the Examiner notes that Bilich et al. also provides for the shut down sequence when the identification does not match an authenticated user (turning off when the user is not authorized).

Re claim 31, though the prior art is silent to deleting information from the storage unit, such limitations have been discussed above. Re claim 26, the Examiner notes that if the card is not detected after a predetermined time, (it is removed), a shutdown sequence occurs.

5. Claims 13, 14, 15, 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang/Bilich et al., as discussed above, in view of Huang et al., as discussed above.

For purposes of Examination, the Examiner has interpreted a computer starter as a display monitor as it controls the powering/operation of the display monitor connected to a system (computer system).

The teachings of Wang/Bilich et al. have been discussed above.

Wang/Bilich et al. are silent to storing information in the storage unit of the display monitor for authenticating the user by comparison to the card information.

Huang et al. teaches such limitations (discussed above) view register 23.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Wang/Bilich et al. with those of Huang et al.

One would have been motivated to do this in order to have a memory so that a comparison of data can be performed efficiently, while also providing the option for record keeping.

Re claims 15 and 29, though silent to deletion of records, the Examiner has discussed such limitations above.

6. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang et al.

For purposes of Examination, the Examiner has interpreted a computer starter as a display monitor as it controls the powering/operation of the display monitor connected to a system (computer system).

The teachings of Huang et al. have been discussed above.

Though silent to deleting of the information from the storage unit, the Examiner notes it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to delete information in order to update user records/performance maintained, as is conventional in the art.

***Additional Remarks***

7. The Examiner has interpreted a display monitor to include a means to monitor if the computer system should be powered up, based on inputs. A computer system is known in the art to include a monitor, in order to be used by a user.

***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection using the references of Wang and Huang et al., as discussed above in response to the Applicants request for support for particular assertions made by the Examiner. In response to the Applicants statement that claim 22 did not include motivation to delete, the Examiner has addressed this issue above. The Examiner notes that as the data storage register 23 includes the user data for authentication and can also include the data read from the card, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to delete the card data after authentication, because if one was to store that data read from the card, it would be storing duplicate data. The Examiner believes that it would have been obvious to store the data in order to compare the information from the card with that on the computer system (for authentication), but that after the comparison is performed, that deletion of the card data would be appropriate, otherwise every time a user tries to access the computer, duplicate data would be stored, which would not serve a functional purpose in light of the Examiners view (discussed above).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

9. Claims 18-21 are allowed.
10. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: The reasons for allowance have been discussed in the previous Office Action.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel I. Walsh whose telephone number is (571) 272-2409. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee can be reached on (571) 272-2398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Daniel I Walsh

Examiner

Art Unit 2876

2-19-06

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Walsh', with a stylized flourish at the end.